DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 898 IR 001 266

AUTHOR	Coplin, William D.
TITLE	Third Stage Report on the Learning Package Project in International Studies Supported by Grant (GY-9343) of the National Science Foundation.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ., N.Y. International Relations Program.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	1 Sep 74
NOTE	16p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; Economics; Field Studies; Geography; Instructional Design; *Instructional Materials; *International Education; Political Science; Psychology; Sociology
IDENTIFIERS	Consortium for International Studies Education

ABSTRACT

The Learning Package Project in International Studies is reported for the activities between August 1973 and October 1974. The first section of the report gives a history of the original packages supported by the project and the contributions made toward developing a group of scholars-instructors necessary to sustain the development, evaluation, and dissemination of learning packages. Next the need for a major effort for the remainder of the project to build a stronger institutional base than now exists is described. Plans to develop packages for sociology, economics, psychology, and geography in addition to political science by establishing a Policy Advisory Board are discussed. (WH)

Third Stage Report on the Learning Package Project in International Studies Supported by Grant (GY-9343) of the National Science Foundation

ED 098 008

Date September 1, 1974

Submitted by:

William D. Coplin
Director, International Relations Program
Syracuse University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRE-
SENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR 001 266

INTRODUCTION

This report is the third in a series for this project. The first appeared in August, 1972 and described the first six months of the project. The second appeared in August, 1973 and reported on the first year and a half. This report will describe the activities between August, 1973 and October, 1974. It will be divided into three sections: (1) a history of the original packages supported by the project, (2) a description of the attempt during 73-74 and the future plans to institutionalize a process for developing, evaluating and disseminating packages, and (3) a description of the plans to generate packages in sociology, psychology, geography and economics to supplement those in political science through the establishment and operation of an advisory board.

The Original Packages from August, 1973 to October, 1974

In Table 1 on the following page, the twenty original proposals for learning packages that were selected for support are listed along with information on the kind of award, their current status as of October 30, 1974 and their likely status by June, 1975. An analysis of this chart reveals that the progress anticipated in August of 1973 was somewhat over-optimistic particularly concerning the potential for adequate revision. Although as we will point out in the next section, the major objective of highlighting and legitimizing the idea of learning packages in international studies undergraduate education was achieved to a considerable extent, the actual package production was less than what was hoped for.

In an effort to learn from this experience, we have analyzed some of the patterns that appear in the chart. Table 2 shows that there is a fairly strong relationship between the size of the award and the likelihood of getting a product. It should be noted that in addition to getting more money, those receiving a $1,000.00 were brought to an initial training sessions and were generally more integrated into the project. It should also be noted that the $1,000.00 winners were given an additional $300.00 budget for materials, typing, etc. while those receiving partial awards were not. In some cases, the partial award winners had to apply their grant to material and typing costs. Given the initial amount of money granted ($11,900 promised and likely to be paid when commitments of the package producers are met) and the number of packages that we can conservatively estimate will be in the system from among those receiving initial grants (five), the average cost per finished package for developer's honorarium is $2,000 a piece.

Table 1: Record of Grants for Package Development

Author	Title of Package	Kind of Award	Status During 1973-74	Likely Status by 6/75
Arthur Banks Political Science SUNY-Binghamton	Cross-National Data Analysis	$1,000	Field-Tested, Revised and Published in Peer-Review System	2,000 copies per year in distribution system
Louis Beres Political Science Purdue	Undergraduate Education in World Order Studies	$1,000	No field tests, revision submitted to Peer-Review System	Being typed for Peer-Review Evaluation. Status Uncertain
Gary Bertsch Political Science U. of Georgia	Communist Studies	$1,000	Field-tested, revised and now submitted to Peer-Review System	Based on examination of existing revisions, we expect this package to be published in the Peer-Review System by early 1975
Dan Caldwell Graduate student, Stanford	Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis	$200.00	Field-tested, author has not revised.	Based on the lack of strong support from field-testers and the changing interest of author, probably no revision will be undertaken. Dead.
Raymond Copson Political Science	International Relations in South Africa	Partial $200.00	Field-tested, author has not revised yet.	We may distribute the tapes made by the author and convert the package into an Instructor's Manual. Uncertain.
Anne Feraru Political Science California State Fullerton	International Conflict	$1,000	Field-tested, revised and Published in Peer-Review System	2,000-5,000 copies per year in the distribution system

Michael Fonte Graduate student, Michigan	China	$1,000 but no money paid	Never received manuscript	Dead
Charles Green Sociologist, U. of Virginia	Intra-National Conflict	$1,000	No field tests, now being revised in two packages for Peer-Review System	Two packages are now being typed for submission to the Peer-Review System. Likely acceptance of either package is about 50-50
Dennis Ray Political Science	Multi-National Corporation	$1,000	Field tested, revised and submitted to Peer-Review System	Final revision now being evaluated. Likely acceptance of the package is about 50-50
Dorothy Guyot Political Science John Jay CUNY	Political Leadership	$1,000	Field tested and now being revised to submit to the Peer-Review System	Awaiting permission from publisher to reprint a crucial article. Will be system for evaluation by December. Likely acceptance of the package is about 50-50
Paul Kattenburg Political Scientist U. of S. Carolina	Diplomatic Practices	$1,000	Field tested and revised. Submitted to the Peer-Review System	Package now being typed for submission. Based on the strong positive response of many users and the satisfactory reviews, there appears to be a better than 50-50 chance of being accepted.

Donald Snow Political Science U. of Alabama	Revolutionary Motivation	$1,000	Field tested and revision submitted to Peer-Review System	Peer-Review Evaluation now being conducted. 50-50 chance of being accepted
John Willmer Geography SUNY, Cortland	Political Geography	$1,000	No field tests, now being revised	Status uncertain
Alfred Monks and Kenyon Griffiths Political Science Wyoming	Images in Foreign Policy	$500.00	Field-tested, now being revised for Peer-Review System Decision	Likely to be submitted
Thomas Stauffer American Council of Education, Political Science	Population Policy Making	$500.00	Field tested, now being revised for Peer-Review System	Likely to be submitted
Richard Fredland Political Science Indiana at	Political Development	$200.00	No field tests, no further action	Dead
Thomas Schlesinger Political Science Plymouth	The State, Nation, etc.	$200.00	No field tests, no further action	Dead
J.A.Mestenhauser Foreign Student Advisor, Minnesota	Foreign Students in International Studies Education	$100.00	First, second and third drafts unacceptable	Dead
Byron Massailes School of Education U. of Florida	Economic Development	$200.00 Partial Award Never paid	So submission	Dead
Shen Ya Dai (unknown)	Chinese Foreign Policy	$200.00 Partial Award Never Paid	No submission	Dead

Table 2: Pattern of Learning Package Development by Awards

	Now In Peer-Review System	Now Being Evaluated for Peer-Review With 50-50 Chance	Likely to Be Submitted For Peer-Review Evaluation	Uncertain	Dead
$1,000.00	2	5	1	2	0
$500.00 or less. Average about $300.00	0	0	2	1	4
No Money Paid Although Grant Awarded	0	0	0	0	3

This cost does not appear to be much of an improvement over traditional publishing standards for book-length manuscripts. It is a cost that a self-sustaining project could not maintained. However, we believe that it was a cost that had to be paid in order to highlight the idea of learning packages, to establish the Consortium for International Studies Education and to provide some experience so that better development, evaluative revision and distribution procedures could be established.

As a result of the experience in the first two stages of the project a decision was made by the Project Director in conjunction with the Executive Secretary of the Consortium, J. Martin Rochester of the University of Missouri, St. Louis and the head of the Executive Committee of the Consortium, James Harf of Ohio State University along with the members of the Consortium, that a no-award, no-royalty, peer-review system ought to be established and maintained. The procedures of that system are described in the brochure enclosed with this report. An editor of the series, one of the more successful original package producers, Anne T. Feraru, was appointed. In addition, a project running out of the office of the Center for International Programs and Comparative Studies of the State of New York Education Department was set up to print and distribute the packages as part of a general project on learning resources in international relations. The system that now exists receives manuscripts from the field, evaluates them through scholarly and pedagogical reviews and then, if approved, prints and distributes them. Proceeds from sales are used to maintain the system.

Fortunately, the Consortium received a $66,000 grant from the National Science Foundation to conduct learning package development workshops. Two of the workshops were held over the summer and two more will be held over the winter months. As a result of those workshops, three packages are now being distributed in the peer-review system (see the list on the brochure) along with the two generated directly by this grant. In addition, the Consortium is already now reviewing ten additional packages as a result of this summer's activities. It expects to generate another fifteen as a result of the winter institutes. The groundwork laid by the initial grant made possible the Consortium's receipt of the workshop grant. Conversely, the success that the Consortium is now having as a result of the workship project is in part a product of the structure and processes that have emerged out of this grant.

A number of packages that have received no support (from either this project or the workshop grant) have been submitted to the Con-

sortium. At this time, one appears to be potentially publishable in the peer-review system. In addition, there are at least three that the Project Director has been told about and has seen that should become viable candidates in the peer-review system by the end of the year. Our hope is that this trend will continue, and that without financial rewards of any kinds, scholars will submit packages to the system.

From what has been said so far, it should be clear that the critical first and second stage of the learning package project has been passed. There are a group of package producers and users now tied together by the Consortium for International Studies Education. The Consortium receives substantial support from a number of sources and appears to be on the brink of maintaining a development and training structure with little or no external funding. If the packages can generate enough sales to support printing and editorial costs, the Consortium can use other funds to take care of the communication, recruitment, evaluation and training costs necessary to maintain a constant flow of new and revised learning packages.

Given the relative success of the first two stages, the Foundation provided an $88,000 supplement to the project in order to accomplish two objectives over the next two years. The first is the institutionalization of the peer-review learning package system. The second is the development of an advisory board structure that will promote the development and dissemination of packages across the social science disciplines. The remainder of this report will outline the plans for achieving these two objectives.

Institutionalization

When discussing the institutionalization of the system to develop, evaluate and disseminate learning package in international studies, the discussion necessarily must focus on the emergence and growth of the Consortium for International Studies Education. Spawned by the requirement to build a dissemination system into the project, the Consortium has developed extensively since its inception in November of 1972. The number of contributing institutional members, working scholars and the mailing list have grown substantially. However, growth alone does not guarantee institutionalization. Hence, we need to develop plans that will form norms and personal commitments necessary for the orderly growth of the Consortium.

First and most importantly, the support for the services of the Consortium comes from a variety of sources and in forms other than money. Table 3 indicates the projected and estimated sources of support for services for June, 1974 to June, 1975. The table indicates that a very small amount of the support comes in the form of cash. This fact creates an enormous administrative burden on the Consortium staff and makes the Consortium extremely vulnerable to the vagaries of part-time and volunteer staff. As such, the fragmentation of resources must be considered the primary problem that the institutionalization of the Consortium must overcome. The obvious and some would argue, most optimal remedy would be a major long-term grant of about $300,000 over a three year period. This would allow the Consortium to centralize most of its operations, to recruit members more systematically, to develop more finished learning packages and to conduct more systematic evaluations.

However, the Consortium leadership has not pursued a strategy based solely on the acquisition of substantial funding. First, the likelihood of getting such funding is small. The National Science Foundation has been generous in its support. The quasi-scientific characteristic of the international relations field makes it impossible to expect much more than partial support from NSF. While the Foundation through both its grant to this project and its support of faculty workshops have underwritten the development of scientific materials, the international studies field requires at least equal support from the humanities also. This support has not been forthcoming. Nor has support from the major foundations been forthcoming. The reasons for this are found in the fact (1) that money is extremely tight in international and comparative fields and (2) that the Consortium leadership has neither the old foreign policy establishment nor the new world order group ties that appear to attract what little money there is. One of the major aims of the Consortium is to demonstrate to these constituencies that learning packages and related materials could improve their educational efforts, and to convince traditional international funding agencies that a non-ideological organization could be worthy of their support. Nevertheless, for the moment, the apparent optimal solution does not appear around the corner.

I have used the term "apparent optimal solution" because much could be said for keeping the financial and human resources of the Consortium fragmented. Spreading the work of the Consortium around institutions of higher education throughout the United States helps to maintain its vitality. It keeps the Consortium from becoming tied to one particular viewpoint or method. In short, it appears

Table 3: Sources of Support for the Consortium

Institutional Source	Type of Support Provided		
	Cash	Salaries	Services
Institutional Members, about 40 at $300.00 per year	$12,000.		
Sales of Materials Above Printing and Distribution Costs	Deficit		
Center for International Studies of University of Missouri, St. Louis		$10,000 For secretary, mail, phones and 1/2 faculty offices	$2,000
Center for International Studies of University of Pittsburgh through the office of the International Studies Association			$5,000 in advertising, bookkeeping
Learning Resources in International Relations of the New York Department of Education		Management of production and distribution system (about $5,000 per year in mailing, bookkeeping, etc.)	
Department of Political Science of Indiana University of Pennsylvania		Editing, producing and distributing the Occasional Paper Series of the Consortium (about $3,000)	
Bowling Green and University of Alabama		Support for 1974 summer Institutes of about $6,000	
NSF Learning Package Project		Editorial, printing and development costs (about $10,000)	
NSF Learning Package Development Workshop		Some training, advertising and evaluation ($3,000)	

that the Consortium will have to become institutionalized while its resources and functions remain fragmented. If this is the case, success rests on establishing extremely clear-cut procedures and recruiting intelligent and dedicated leadership.

Procedures are becoming routinized in the following areas:

1. Communication and Membership Recruitment: The Center for International Studies of the University of Missouri has served as the central communication point for members and leaders of the Consortium. It is now mounting an extensive recruiting job. The brochure attached with this report represents a major commitment in this direction. A policy of institutional members only at $300.00 per year has been established and a June to June billing year procedure is now operating.

2. Peer-Review Editorial Activities: Manuscripts are submitted to the central office of the Consortium. The editor, Anne T. Feraru of Fullerton identifies scholarly reviewers and pedagogical reviewers. The central offices sends copies of the manuscript along with a form letter. Feraru evaluates the reviews and if she decides to publish the manuscripts, the central office sends the camera-ready copy to the Learning Resources in International Relations Project in New York. Some problems in getting the reviews have been encountered, but a recent letter of inquiry has identified a bank of reviewers.

3. Learning Package Production and Distribution: The Learning Resources in International Relations project prints, stores, bills and advertises the packages. The project returns all funds acquired via sales of the package beyond the printing, storing, and mailing costs. Estimates at this time suggest that from 40 to 60% of the price of the package will be returned to the Consortium.

4. Continuous Evaluation of Packages: Files are kept in the central office on all packages. Student questionnaires appear as a matter of routine at the end of each package. These questionnaires are collected by the instructor and sent to the Consortium offices. Results of these evaluations are discussed at meetings of the International Studies Association meeting. They are also used for revision purposes.

5. Distribution of a Newsletter: The central office prepares a newsletter every two months that goes to about 2,000 people on a mailing list built up from inquiries. The newsletter is used to recruit new members and packages, and to advertise existing materials.

6. Occasional Paper: Gerald Thorpe of the University of Indiana--Pennsylvania with the support of his school has edited and distributed an occasional paper. The purposes and initial list of the papers is described in the brochure. Basically, this publication allows for less developed materials to be distributed to interested members of the Consortium.

7. Training: Perhaps, its most successful and visible operation has been training institutes. The Consortium has conducted one-week summer institutes plus one-day workshops at regional and national conventions to recruit faculty members into the use of learning packages. While there is rarely a direct consequence of these training sessions in the form of an immediate acceptance and use of learning packages, the long-range results should not be underemphasized. Many of the current institutional members of the Consortium were attracted by the training institute. Moreover, at the Bowling Green institute last summer over fifty percent of those attending had worked in the evenings on developing their own packages. In fact, with no outside support, four packages are now in draft stage about to be submitted to the Consortium as a result of these training institutes. The Consortium plans to run a two-week institute in St. Louis during June of 1975. The increase in demand and the availability of about twenty packages by that time requires that a modular and longer format be used. Hopefully, this will become a permanent activity of the Consortium.

Over the next two years, the patterns we have just discussed should become sufficiently routinized to insure not only the survival of the Consortium but the creation of a set of institutionalized procedures that will support the development, evaluation and distribution of learning packages without substantial outside support. We also hope to attract the kinds of people that we have in the past. Given the low prospect of a major sustaining grant and the fragmented nature of the Consortium's resources and activities, probability of success is not particularly high. However, it is higher now than it was a year ago.

Another area of development that the Consortium will have to take more seriously is the selling of the learning package idea. Two activities are now underway to aid in this respect. One is to get the most well-known figures in the field to participate, if not in the packages, at least in modern educational techniques. Kenneth Boulding has produced a number of packages. A video-tape of many of the first-ranked scholars is now distributed through the Consortium. And Marshal Windmiller is developing a slide-tape on the ideas of Karl W. Deutsch, whom many consider to be the most out-

standing political scientist in the comparative-international relations division of political science.* Another activity is to produce highly refined slide-tapes and/or other forms of communication on the nature and uses of learning packages. Plans are now underway to develop a follow-up to the "learning package on how to make a social sciences learning package" published in a newsletter of the Consortium. In addition, a slide-tape on how to use learning package in classroom as well as independent study situations is also now being planned. These activities will not only make our training sessions more effective. They will also help to recruit faculty to the goals of the Consortium.

In addition to the procedures outlined above, the Consortium has to develop in the very near future the general outlines of a learning package plan. If the number of packages produced increase at the expected rate, some guidelines will have to be developed concerning priorities in subject-matter. This assumes that criteria and procedures for scholarly and pedagogical quality already exists. At this time, there are no clear-cut categories in which learning packages can be placed or even from which specific topics can be identified. However, over the next two years such a set of categories will be developed and a more rationalized system of relating packages to each other will emerge.

Involving More Social Science Disciplines

A second major activity over the next two years is to involve a broader spectrum of social scientists than are now involved in the learning package system. While there are some economists, sociologists and education specialists participating in the package development, evaluation and training, there is far too great a proportion of political scientists. Some additional political science packages will be added as a matter of the natural course of the Consortium. However, a special effort is now underway to recruit legitimizing and producing personnel from the disciplines of sociology, economics, geography and psychology. This movement into the other disciplines is being pursued in conjunction with an attempt to get a high-level advisory board to supply general guidelines for topic areas to be covered.

As of October 30, 1974, James Harf, Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Consortium has received acceptances from the following to be members of a Policy Board of the Consortium Learning Package Project:

---

*In a unpublished citation study by Richard B. Finnegan and John J. Giles, Stonehill College, Deutsch was number 1 in citations between 1958 and 1973 with 131 citations. His nearest rival had 83 citations.

From Political Science:

Harold D. Lasswell, Policy Sciences Center, Inc.
Richard Merritt, Political Science Department, University of Illinois-Urbana
Philip M. Burgess, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University

From Economics:

Kenneth Boulding, Department of Economics, University of Colorado
Mancur Olson, Woodrow Wilson Center, Washington, D.C. (acceptance for the first meeting only)

From Geography:

Harm DeBlij, Department of Geography, University of Miami
Philip Porter, Department of Geography, University of Minnesota

From Psychology:

Marshall Segal, Social Science Program, Syracuse University

From Sociology:

Everett Wilson, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina--Chapel Hill

A number of prominent people have turned Professor Harf down, including Charles E. Osgood, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois--Urbana, Wassily Leontieff, Department of Economics, Harvard University and
At this time, there is a meeting planned for sometime in November. Greater difficulty than was anticipated has occurred in the attempt to recruit the kind of leadership across the social sciences that was hoped for at the outset of this phase of the project. This is so even though the administrative wings of the major professional associations involved (e.g., American Economic Association, Association of American Geographers, American Sociology Association) were contacted for help. The individuals contacted were extremely supportive although they warned us that there is not a sufficiently strong commitment to education to yield the kind of support we were looking for.

The Policy Board will have the following responsibilities:

1. Serve as an advisory committee to the Peer-Review Learning Package system by evaluating the existing procedures now followed in the system.

2. Help in identifying individual and institutional resources in their respective disciplines that could aid in developing, disseminating and evaluating learning packages.

3. Identify topics for which learning packages whould be developed given the convergence of their disciplinary interests and the demands of contemporary undergraduate education.

The Policy Board will meet no more than twice a year for a one-day meeting. They will be provided extensive briefing materials prior to the meeting, and will be kept informed throughout the remainder of the year on the progress of the project.

The interdisciplinary aims of the project have also been served by the NSF workshop grant to the Consortium. The proposal for that grant indicated that scholars from other disciplines will be recruited to develop packages in transnational policy areas. Extensive advertising of the competition for the winter institutes was conducted in the periodicals of the appropriate professional organizations. In addition, I have contacted the program officers of sociology, economics, social psychology, and political science of the Social Science Division of the National Science Foundation. These directors provided me with a list of scholars who have recently completed work that could be appropriate for learning packages. It appears that the leads provided by these program officers will generate a number of packages in the various fields. We hope that the people identified through this process will also serve in an advisory capacity as the Consortium seeks to service faculty from various social science disciplines.

In the long run, we believe that the future of the Consortium may depend upon the success we have in generating packages from various social science disciplines. As resources become more constrained, university administrators call for less duplication, and students for more multidisciplinary relevance, a capacity to offer packages and instructional training for using those packages across the disciplines may make the difference in getting institutional membership. If an economist, sociologist and political scientist simultaneously approach their Dean for support to improve their instructional capabilities, the chances of institu-

tional support are higher than if a faculty member from only one department makes the request. For this reason, the movement to involve more disciplines is part of the strategy for institutionalization.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The following points should serve as a summary and conclusion to this report:

1. The original project has made a major contribution in (a) developing a set of procedures and identifying a group of scholars-instructors necessary to sustain the development, evaluation and dissemination of learning packages, and (b) generating at least two and as many as ten packages that will be distributed through the system.

2. A major effort for the remainder of the project will be devoted to building a stronger institutional base than now exists to maintain the system in addition to generating more learning packages. The functions of recruiting members, developing, evaluating, and distributing packages as well as providing a structure for selecting topic areas will be more effectively performed as this institutionalization takes place.

3. A second major effort will be to develop packages for sociology, economics, psychology and geography in addition to political science by establishing a Policy Advisory Board. This Board will also provide guidance in establishing a procedure to select topics that maximize the interface between the disciplinary interests of most scholars and the problem focus of most students in the international studies area.